UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,307	10/24/2003	Shalaby W. Shalaby	PC25466A	1484

28523 7590 03/03/2009

PFIZER INC.
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611
EASTERN POINT ROAD
GROTON, CT 06340

EXAMINER	
MAEWALL, SNIGDHA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1612	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

~IPGSGro@pfizer.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/693,307	SHALABY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Snigdha Maewall	1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-12-* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt of Applicant's Arguments filed on 11/25/08 is acknowledged.

Claims 2-3 and 13 remain cancelled. Claims 1 and 4-12 are under prosecution.

The rejections made under 35 USC 112.1 in the Office action dated 05/29/08 is hereby withdrawn in view of Applicant's Arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "50% ionically bonded together to form said liquid conjugate". The rationale behind this limitation is not clear to the examiner because claim 1 requires liquid polymer and basic drug which are ionically bonded together. Since the liquid polymer and basic drug are ionic in nature, it is obvious that the reaction will be in equimolar ratio which is inconsistent with the claimed limitation of 50% ionically bonded together. The claim is thus indefinite.

Claim 11 recites the limitation “an amine bearing polymer". Since claim 1 from which claim 11 is dependent on, requires ionically bonded liquid polymer and basic drug. It is unclear as how an amine bearing polymer will form ionic bond with amine bearing basic drug.

Claim 1 recites “basic drug”. It is unclear if the drug is alkaline and thus basic in nature or bears an amino group. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalaby to (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,159) in view of Kim et al. to (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,304 B1).

Shalaby discloses a hydrogel-forming, self-solvating, absorbable polyester copolymers capable of selective, segmental association into a compliant hydrogel mass on contact with an aqueous environment (abstract). According to Shalaby, the copolymer comprises a base component, designated as "Component A”. The “Component A” refers to the basic structure of the

copolymers of the invention. “Component A” comprises a molecular chain having a hydrophilic block “Y” and a relatively hydrophobic polyester block “X”. The hydrophobic block/segmented polymer comprises a polyester formed by grafting a glycolide, lactide, .epsilon.-caprolactone, p-dioxanone, trimethylene carbonate or combinations thereof, onto the hydroxylic or amino groups of a hydrophilic polymer precursor. The hydrophilic block comprises a polyoxyethylene, Poly (oxyethylene-b-oxypropylene), polypeptide polyalkylene oxamate, a polysaccharide, and derivatives thereof; or a liquid, high molecular weight polyether glycol interlinked with an oxalate or succinate functionalities in linear or branched form (column 6 and 7, lines 65-67 and 1-15).
“Component A” optionally comprises carboxylic end groups which facilitates ionically binding a bioactive agent or drug (column 7, lines 19-23). The composition comprises an absorbable carrier which helps in immediate and controlled release of the bioactive drug. (column 7, lines, 30-33).

According to Shalaby a copolymer optionally comprises a bioactive agent; such a copolymer is capable of the controlled-release of a biologically active agent for modulating cellular events such as wound healing and tissue regeneration (column 6, lines 30-45). The copolymer described by Shalaby is capable of being injected into living tissues (column 6, line 57) (hence proving that the copolymer is liquid conjugate). The hydrophobic block ”X” as described above refers to absorbable polyester chain block(s) or segment(s) of variable length, which is a viscous liquid at room temperature.

These hydrophobic block (s)"X "comprises, copolymeric segments of glycolide, l-lactide, trimethylene carbonate (column 8, lines 4-9).

The "Hydrophilic Block(s)" or segment (s) "Y" comprises poly (oxyethylene) (column 8, lines 17-18).

Shalaby further discloses that the length of the hydrophilic block "Y" and its weight fractions can be varied to modulate the rate of gel formation, its modulus, its water content, and diffusivity of bioactive drug (column 8, lines 23-37). Shalaby discloses that to render "Component A" more receptive to basic drugs, its end-groups can optionally be carboxylated (column 10, lines 1-5). "Component A" can be succinylated to provide acidic end-groups for ionic binding on the bioactive agent/drug (column 12, lines 8-10).

Shalaby further discloses that liquid compositions made of component A with or without drug or bioactive agent can form hydrogels upon contacting a liquid environment (column 12, lines 10-12). The "Component A" as disclosed in the reference, comprises an inherent viscosity at 25 degrees C in chloroform ranging between 0.03 to 0.80 dL/g and can be present as a liquid at room temperature and can be administered through a syringe needle (column 10, lines 10-17). The liquid conjugate, "Component A" in this case can combine with bioactive drugs such as calcium (column 12, lines 58-59) hence proving the ionic bond linkage between the liquid conjugate and the bioactive drug. Shalaby to (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,159) does not specifically teach the bioactive agent such as Ziprasidone (aryl- heterocyclic compound).

Kim et al. teaches aryl- heterocyclic drug such as Ziprasidone. Kim et al. discloses that increasing drug solubility and stability through appropriate formulation can lead to therapeutic efficacy of the drug (column 1, lines 17-20). On (column 3, lines 10-27), Kim et al. discloses that ziprasidone has utility as a neruleptic drug, and is thus useful as neuroleptic/antipsychotic drug (column 3, lines 26-30). It is due to this utility of ziprasidone, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Ziprasidone in the liquid conjugate as a bioactive drug or alternately to use polymers and carboxyl-bearing polymers or carboxyl-bearing block/segment as forwarded by Shalaby, with Ziprasidone to make liquid conjugate because Ziprasidone acts as an antipsychotic as disclosed my Kim et al. Addionally, since Ziprasidone happens to be basic in nature, it would be expected for ziprasidone to form ionic bond with carboxyl-bearing polymers or block/ segment copolymers which are acidic in nature. A skilled artisan would thus have been motivated to formulate a liquid conjugate comprising Ziprasidone and absorbable polymer with one or more carboxyl group with a reasonable expectation of success.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Shalaby does not essentially include terminal or otherwise accessible carboxyl moieties.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because Shalaby discloses that that to render "Component A" more receptive to basic drugs, its end-groups can optionally be carboxylated (column 10, lines 1-5). "Component A" can be succinylated to provide acidic end-groups for ionic binding on the bioactive agent/drug (column 12, lines 8-10).

Applicant argues that Shalaby teaches hydrogel-forming copolymers which form a compliant hydrogel mass on contact with aquoeous environment. However, looking at the Examples provided in Applicants' specification, Applicants' claimed liquid conjugates do not gel and remain essentially liquid when contacted with an aqueous medium. In Example 7, on pages 12-13, of the Application, exemplary conjugates of the claimed invention are exposed to phosphate buffered saline (PBS). PBS is an aqueous medium. However, no hydrogel mass is formed when the exemplary conjugates are contacted with the PBS.

Applicants arguments are not persuasive because in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Applicants' claimed liquid conjugates do not gel and remain essentially liquid when contacted with an aqueous medium. In Example 7, on pages 12-13, of the Application, exemplary conjugates of the claimed invention are exposed to phosphate buffered saline (PBS). PBS is an aqueous medium. However, no hydrogel mass is formed when the exemplary conjugates are contacted with the PBS) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants submit that the Examiner is using hindsight reasoning. It is true that ziprasidone has basic moieties. But to conclude that it would have been obvious to use ziprasidone (due to its basic moities) in combination with the polymers described in the Shalaby reference to form the claimed liquid conjugates uses hindsight reasoning: First, their is no mention in the Shalaby reference to use basic drugs. There is no suggestion to form ionic interactions in the Shalaby reference. And there is no suggestion in the Shalaby reference to use the polymers therein to increase the solubility of a drug substance. It would not have been obvious to use ziprasidone with the polymers in the Shalaby reference. And, even if one did combine ziprasidone with the polymers in the Shalaby reference, there is no teaching in the Shalaby reference, or the Kim et al.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the instant case, due to the basic characteristics of Ziprasidone and the claimed polymer, a skilled artisan would have expected to form ionic conjugated product with a reasonable expectation of success. Shalaby's reference suggests ionic conjugate such as polymers with carboxyl groups and suggests being used with basic active agents. Ziprasidone comprises nitrogen with lone pair of electron;

therefore, a skilled artisan would have formulated a liquid conjugated product with an expectation of the product comprising ionic conjugation due to acidic and basic characteristics with a reasonable expectation of success. It should be noted that the motivation to combine references need not be the same as applicant's motivation. In the instant case, combination of Ziprasidone with the suggested polymers of Shalaby would have been obvious due to its utility.

It should be noted that claim 1 as recited does not recite any specific polymer, the claims generically recite polycarbonate, a polyester carbonate etc. The claims as recited do not commensurate with the scope of the disclosure because not all or every generically claimed polycarbonate, polyester carbonate or polyester carrying two or more carboxyl has been disclosed to be liquid conjugate. There is no specific recitation of specific polymers. Prior art teaches combination of polycarbonate with basic drug, as such substitution of any basic drug would have been within the purview of a skilled artisan at the time of instant invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Snigdha Maewall whose telephone number is (571)-272-6197. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday; 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-0580.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Snigdha Maewall/

Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Gollamudi S Kishore /

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612